



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

rich wieder ins Leben hinein. Es war eine Sanftheit in ihm und ebenso draussen in der Natur, die ihm eine liebe Erfahrung war. . . . Ein Gewitter war reinigend aus Schwefelwolken herabgefahren und grollte nur noch leise und, auf Nimmerwiederkehr vorüber, am fernen Horizonte hin. . . . 'Es ist schade, dass keine Vögel singen,' erklärte eines Tages [therefore well on toward the middle of April] Friedrich. 'Ja,' sagte Miss Eva Burns, die das Mansardfenster geöffnet hatte, 'das ist schade!' 'Denn,' fuhr Friedrich fort, 'Sie sagen ja doch, dass es draussen um den Hanoversee [the house in which Friedrich lies ill is situated on the edge of the lake some distance from the town of Meriden] schon grünelt!' 'Was heisst das "grünelt"?' fragte Miss Eva Burns. Friedrich lachte. Darauf sagte er ruhig: 'Der Frühling kommt! Und ein Frühling ohne Vogelmusik ist ein taubstummer Frühling.'"<sup>5</sup>

In view of the repetition in 1912 of the first statement of the impression of 1833, the coincidence of experience and length of the sojourn of the two poets in America may be of interest. Lenau landed at Baltimore on the 8th of October, 1832, crossed the Alleghanies to New Economy in Pennsylvania, and went from there in the dead of winter to take possession of the land he had purchased in Ohio. Returning to New Economy about the end of February, he started from there on March 15th for New York City by way of Niagara and Albany, sailing for home the first week in May. Hauptmann arrived in New York in the autumn of 1893. He proceeded to Meriden on February 4th, 1894, and lived with a friend, making various trips to Hartford, Springfield, New York and Washington, and sailing back to Germany on May 3d.

At this point it is difficult to decide whether (as Mulfinger has done in the case of Lenau) to call attention to the fact that at the time these two poets were in America (except for the latter part of their stay), getting their impressions of songless birds and other American crudities, they would hardly have found the birds singing in Hungary, Swabia or Silesia; or to point out the fact that (except after unusually hard winters) in the neigh-

borhood of New York in an ordinary spring, birds are to be heard singing from the middle of April, or even earlier. Certainly our poets, unless deaf or too closely engrossed in New York City life, could have heard such early and common songsters as our robins, bluebirds, wrens, song-sparrows and meadow-larks, and perhaps even the cardinal-grosbeak. If Lenau did, he ignored the fact and let the impression of October and early March stand. It is difficult to say whether Hauptmann is relying on literature or mere fancy.

JACOB N. BEAM.

Princeton, N. J.

---

*Tristan and Isolt, a Study of the Sources of the Romance.* By GERTRUDE SCHOEPPERLE. Frankfurt a. M., Baer & Co.; London, Nutt, 1913. 1 vol. in 2 parts, xiv + 1-266 and 267-590 pp. Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs (New York University), No. 6-7.

Even before the appearance of Bédier's edition<sup>1</sup> of Thomas's *Tristan* there had been a tendency among students of the Tristan legend to regard all the principal versions of this story as derivatives of a lost French metrical romance, but it was Bédier who established the fact conclusively.<sup>2</sup> It was natural, however, that, whilst accepting his general result, scholars should have differed with him on some points of importance in regard to the affiliation of the existing versions and consequently in regard to the reconstruction of their lost common source. Furthermore, Bédier minimizes the Celtic element in the famous legend. Now, whatever may be one's conclusions on this

<sup>1</sup> Paris, 1902-5, published (in 2 vols.) for the Société des Anciens Textes Français.

<sup>2</sup> Bédier, II, 313, may be going too far when he derives from this lost romance not only all the principal versions but all versions whatever. In my own judgment he is right, but Miss Schoepperle (pp. 8 f.) is inclined to except the continuation of Béroul and the prose *Tristan*.

<sup>5</sup> *Atlantis*, p. 341 ff.

aspect of the Tristan romances, it is evident that the French scholar had not made the necessary researches in the extant saga material of the Celts to determine this question with the accuracy that is desirable. To the discussion of all these matters—and some others, besides—the treatise before us is a contribution of the highest value.

In the discussion of sources the first task is to fix the character of the lost French romance from which the principal versions (Bérout, the *Tristrant* of Eilhart von Oberge, and Thomas), to say nothing of the *Folie Tristan*, are descended. In Miss Schoepperle's opinion Eilhart von Oberge represents "more accurately than any reconstruction that has been made, and more faithfully than any other version (except perhaps the fragment of Bérout)" this lost romance—the *estoire*, as, following her example, we shall call it.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, in the third section of her work she endeavors to establish this view by subjecting to a critical examination Bédier's reconstruction of the lost source. Like Zenker, Kelemina, and Muret before her,<sup>4</sup> she rejects his table of concordances as proving nothing, so that in her criticism of his reconstruction of the archetype it is with the "Discussions" in his Second Volume that she deals. The main difference between her stemma of the versions and Bédier's is that she would eliminate the secondary (common) source for Bérout and Eilhart (Bédier's *y*), which the latter postulates, and derive these two versions directly and independently from the archetype (the *estoire*).<sup>5</sup> It was the difference of conception concerning the duration of the efficacy of the love-potion which appears

in the different versions that led Bédier to postulate the secondary source just mentioned. In Bérout the influence of the potion is limited to three years.<sup>6</sup> In Eilhart von Oberge it suffers a certain diminution in its efficacy at the end of four years.<sup>7</sup> In Thomas<sup>8</sup> and the Prose Romance<sup>9</sup> there is no diminution in its influence up to the end. The conception in the two versions last named is plainly more primitive, and this fact, no doubt, induced Bédier to accept it as belonging to the archetype and to regard Bérout and Eilhart in this point as secondary. But inasmuch as Bérout and Eilhart are, neither of them, derived the one from the other, it became necessary to postulate for them a common (lost) source, intermediate between them and the archetype. According to Bédier the motive which led the author or redactor of this common source (the *y* of his scheme) to modify the primitive conception as to the unlimited efficacy of the love-potion was as follows: Observing the prolonged periods of separation of the lovers in the latter part of the romance, he introduced the idea which we find in Eilhart that the influence of the potion abated after four years. He did this in order to make their passion appear "more spontaneous, more voluntary, more human."<sup>10</sup> Bérout, according to this interpretation, is less faithful than Eilhart to their common source.

The difference of conception which we are here dealing with gives a different conclusion to the forest-episode in the Bérout-Eilhart and Thomas versions, respectively. According to Thomas, when<sup>11</sup> Mark discovered the lovers sleeping side by side in their cave but with a sword between them, he was convinced by this circumstance of their innocence and summoned them back to court in terms of friendship. After their return, however, Tristan and Isolt

<sup>3</sup> W. Golther, *Tristan und Isolde* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 103, had already expressed the opinion that Eilhart was essentially identical with the lost source (*Ur-Tristan*, as he calls it): "Eilhart der nicht erheblich vom ursprünglichen Gedicht sich entfernte und darum im ganzen und einzelnen mit ihm übereinstimmt." See, too, p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> See the references which she gives, p. 71, note 6.

<sup>5</sup> Golther had expressed the same views as Miss Schoepperle with regard to the relations of these versions to the archetype. See his *Tristan und Isolde*, p. 59, Cp. too, Muret, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, XXXVII, 171 (1911).

<sup>6</sup> See E. Muret's edition of Bérout's *Tristan*, II. 2133 ff. Paris, 1903 (Société des Anciens Textes Français).

<sup>7</sup> Cp. F. Lichtenstein's edition of Eilhart's *Tristrant*, II. 2279 ff. Strassburg, 1877 (Quellen und Forschungen XIX).

<sup>8</sup> Bédier, I, 142.

<sup>9</sup> Bédier, II, 340 f.

<sup>10</sup> Bédier, II, 239.

<sup>11</sup> Bédier, I, 241 ff.

renew their intrigue, and the king, led by the dwarf, catches them together again in a garden—asleep but clasped in mutual embraces. Tristan wakes just in time to see that they have been detected, bids farewell to Isolt and makes his escape across the seas to Brittany, where he meets Isolt of Brittany. On the other hand, Isolt of Cornwall persuades Mark that his eyes have deceived him as to the scene in the garden and is restored to favor. In Bérout and Eilhart<sup>12</sup> we have the same scene of Mark's discovering the lovers in the forest. Moreover, in these poems he draws the same inference from the sword as to their innocence. But all this has no influence on the subsequent narrative. The king exchanges rings with Isolt, takes Tristan's sword and leaves his own behind—consequently, when the lovers awake they know that they have been discovered and they fly still further from the court. In the course of time, however, as stated above, in these versions the influence of the potion diminishes, the lovers confess to a hermit in the forest, Ogrin (Ugrim) by name, and, exhorted and advised by him, Tristan conveys a letter to Mark in which he declares that he will restore Isolt to him (and, Bérout adds, will defend her chastity in single combat against all comers). The king takes her back but refuses to allow Tristan to remain in his dominions. The latter, then, goes over to Brittany.

It is Miss Schoepperle's contention (pp. 75-84) that in these features of the narrative as elsewhere Eilhart and Bérout represent the *estoire* more accurately than Thomas. The abatement of the influence of the love-potion and the part played by the hermit were accordingly in the *estoire*, she maintains, and Thomas suppressed these features, because they did not harmonize with his ideal of love (the *amour courtois*). Having suppressed them, however, he had to supply a new motive for Tristan's exile and consequently he invented the garden scene which is peculiar to his version.

Miss Schoepperle's argument on this point

is certainly a very able one and she may very well have hit the truth of the matter. For my own part, however, I still find it hard to accept this reconstruction of the *estoire*. It is evident on the face of it that the limited efficacy of the love-potion and the part played by the hermit represents a degradation of some earlier version in which no limit of time was set to the magical influence that bound the lovers together. The only point is at what stage in the tradition did the degradation take place. According to Miss Schoepperle (p. 445), in the original Tristan legend (a Celtic elopement story) the king lured the lovers back from the forest merely for the purpose of killing the hero, which he does. The story, however, was so popular that a French poet decided to prolong the hero's life.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly he brought the lovers back safely to Mark's court and gave a continuation to the original story, this continuation consisting of a series of adventures, returns and secret visits of the outlawed Tristan, the story of the second Isolt, etc. This first (hypothetical) French version which she calls B she assumes (p. 446) to have been the source of the *estoire*.

Now, in the Celtic parallels (cp. pp. 401 ff.) it is a love-spot and a *geis* (taboo) that bind the lovers together. The tales do not mention a love-potion and they contain no one pivotal scene like that of the Tristan romances when Tristan and Isolt on the ship drain the fatal draught together. Is it likely then that a French poet with such a story before him would have sprung at once from the *geis* conception to the degraded *motif* of a love-drink that is in full operation for only four years, coupled with the other commonplace *motif* (which is out of harmony with the whole spirit of the story) of Tristan's taking the momentous step of returning Isolt to her husband on the advice of a priest who has heard their confession? To me, at least, this appears very improbable.

<sup>12</sup> H. Suchier, too, had supposed that the story originally ended with the return from the forest and that the versions which vary from this point on were due to different continuations. Cp. H. Suchier and A. Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur*, I, 116.

<sup>13</sup> Bérout, ll. 1981 ff., and Eilhart, ll. 4617 ff.

The B version, whether a regular metrical romance or merely a loose oral narrative (in prose) of shifting form, must have ascribed, I should say, a lasting influence to the potion. But if the B version put no limit on the efficacy of the potion and the same thing is true of Thomas, is it likely that the version which transmitted the story from the one to the other—viz., the *estoire*—was different from these versions? Is it not more natural to suppose that the variation of Eilhart and Béroul here is due to a secondary source? The *Folie Tristan* of the Berne ms. points also to the existence of such a secondary source; for that poem, though so closely allied with Béroul, contains allusions to adventures which are not found in the latter.<sup>14</sup> It seems to me, too, that a secondary source gives the most likely explanation of the introduction of Arthur and his knights into Béroul and Eilhart. On the other hand, I do not believe that the author of this secondary source in changing the narrative as to the efficacy of the love-potion was influenced by the motive which Bédier ascribes to him, viz., the desire to make the passion of the lovers "more spontaneous, more voluntary, more human." In my judgment, he is simply offering an awkward explanation of why in the

latter part of the romance the lovers endure such long periods of separation.

I have dwelt at, perhaps, inordinate length on the classification of the versions for the reason that this is the main point on which I find myself in disagreement with Miss Schoepperle. As a matter of fact, her discussion of this subject (including her analysis of Eilhart's *Tristrant*) occupies hardly one-fifth of her whole book. Even more important are the questions of the date of the *estoire* and its debt to Celtic sources. To these questions and to that of the element of general popular tradition in the *estoire* the remainder of her treatise is devoted.

As regards the date of the *estoire*, Miss Schoepperle (pp. 112 ff.) comes to the conclusion, justly, in my opinion, that the *estoire* was composed in the second half of the twelfth century,<sup>15</sup> not in the first half, as Bédier<sup>16</sup> and Golther<sup>17</sup> would have us believe. She first shows that there is no reason for accepting 1154 as the date of the lyric by Bernart de Ventadour which gave these writers their *terminus ad quem* for the *estoire*. Moreover, she urges rightly against Bédier that we should determine the date of this archetype not by the *most* primitive traits but by the *least* primitive traits that it contains. Owing, then, to the spirit of the *amour courtois* that colored it and to the connection of certain of its episodes with the *pastourelles* and *chansons de mal mariée* she concludes that the *estoire* belonged to the second half of the century—indeed, to its later decades. She does not observe, however, that this conclusion has an important bearing on the old debate as to the date of the first Arthurian romances, or, in one of its forms, whether there were Arthurian romances before Chrétien de Troyes; for the strongest single argument for the existence of such romances was what seemed the assured fact of the exist-

<sup>14</sup> Bédier concludes reasonably from these circumstances that the author of this *Folie Tristan* followed "un roman aujourd'hui perdu, apparenté, mais non identique à celui de Béroul." See his *Les deux poèmes de la Folie Tristan*, pp. 82 f., Paris, 1907 (Société des Anciens Textes Français).

Miss Schoepperle, like Bédier, II, 259 ff., and W. Golther, pp. 51, 153, though for different reasons, attributes to Thomas the invention of the *vergier* scene. She regards it (p. 80) as a variant of the forest discovery scene. It seems to me, however, to have been inspired by some tale akin to those that are so numerous in the Orient, of a woman who is caught in a garden sleeping with her lover, but by an ingenious trick satisfies her husband that she is guiltless. Cp. J. J. Meyer's *Isolde's Gottesurteil in seiner erotischen Bedeutung*, pp. 129 ff., Berlin, 1914. Thomas evidently had an original of some sort for this episode in which the dwarf played a part, for in his narrative Mark leaves this dwarf behind to keep an eye on the lovers whilst he goes to fetch witnesses, but nothing more is heard of him (the dwarf).

<sup>15</sup> Wendelin Foerster, p. lxvi of his small *Odysseus*, 3d edition (Halle, 1910), had already put it after 1150, but he presents no elaborate argument on the subject.

<sup>16</sup> II, 154.

<sup>17</sup> Pp. 69 ff.

ence of an early Tristan romance. One may say, perhaps, that there still remains Miss Schoepperle's hypothetical B-version (Wendelin Foerster's "Ur-Urtristan"), but even granting that this was a regular metrical romance there is no reason that compels us to put it much earlier than the *estoire*.<sup>18</sup>

Space fails us to consider in detail the section on the elements of general popular tradition in the *estoire* and its narrative technique. Suffice it to say that we have here the fullest and most careful discussion of these matters that has yet appeared. Of special value is the final division of the treatise which deals with the relation of the *estoire* to Celtic tradition. Miss Schoepperle has made a thorough examination of the great body of Celtic saga-material (mainly Irish, of course) for parallels to the Tristan story and she presents here the results of her researches. Having read the materials which she has collected on the subject, we may differ with her as to the extent of the debt of the French poets to Celtic tradition, but she has put us in a position to form a judgment on the subject as no one else has. It is her conclusion that a Celtic *Aithed* (elopement story), similar to the story of *Diarmaid and Grainne*, formed the starting-point of the Tristan legend. She does not appear to have observed that the late J. F. Campbell had already remarked on the identity of the Tristan legend with the Celtic saga just named.<sup>19</sup> The story of Tristan's youth, his quest of a bride for his uncle together with the marriage, and

the whole episode of Iseult of Brittany she regards as additions of the French poets, who drew on popular tradition (Celtic, in part) for their incidents.<sup>20</sup> The sum and substance of it is to employ Miss Schoepperle's own words (p. 400): "The Celtic tradition of Tristan was modified by the French poets almost beyond recognition, and brought into conformity with French customs and French habits of thought." A comparison of the French romances with the texts which she gives proves to my mind, at least, that Celtic tradition furnished the French writers merely with the suggestion of the love-story<sup>21</sup> and its forest setting and possibly with one or two other incidents besides. The power of the story in the French romances, however, is due to the initial scene of Tristan and Isolt's love with its definite symbolism that dominates the rest of the narrative, to the elaboration of the forest scenes, to the true and vivid picture of the passion that constantly draws the hero back to the heroine, contrary to the obligations of kinship and personal loyalty and despite every variety of obstacle, not permitting him to forget her even in the embraces of another woman. Now, the corresponding Celtic texts such as *The Reproach of Diarmaid*<sup>22</sup> have their own beauty, but one has only to read them to see that the French romances are essentially a new creation.<sup>23</sup> The same remark, I believe, applies in even fuller measure to the romances of Chrétien de Troyes.

Miss Schoepperle makes no attempt to deal with the problem as to what part of the Celtic

<sup>18</sup> Is there any real ground for the assumption of "toute une première floraison de poèmes arthuriens" (Bédier, II, 154) between 1066 and Chrétien's appearance? The arguments for this assumption are crumbling one by one. Miss Schoepperle has, without observing it, taken away the argument from the early *Tristan*. The figures on the Modena cathedral have turned out to be not so ancient as was once supposed. The Arthurian names in Italy have not the importance that was ascribed to them (cp. E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois*, pp. 395 ff.). There only remain the Arthurian names in the *Erec*, 1691 ff., 1934 ff., but these may have been taken from popular tales.

<sup>19</sup> Cp. his *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, IV, p. 240 (4 vols., London, 1890-1893).

<sup>20</sup> Miss Schoepperle has performed a notable service in eliminating from the problem of Tristan origins what has been commonly regarded as an Old Norse element—viz., the island-combat between Tristan and the Morholt. She proves (pp. 338 ff.) that this is merely "a stereotyped incident of mediaeval French literature."

<sup>21</sup> I do not see any evidence, however, that the moral conflict in the Celtic original was very strongly emphasized.

<sup>22</sup> Translated by J. H. Lloyd, O. J. Bergin, and G. Schoepperle, *Revue Celtique*, XXXIII, pp. 54 ff. (1912).

<sup>23</sup> Instructive on the relations between the French romances and their Celtic sources are J. Loth's remarks, *Revue Celtique*, XXXIV, 386-395 (1913).

world gave birth to the legend of Tristan and Isolt. Moreover, she purposely leaves out of her discussion the meagre Welsh materials relating to the story, since they are vague, of uncertain date and of doubtful authenticity (p. 2, note 1).<sup>24</sup> On the whole, this procedure is to be commended although the obscure fragments of the Black Book of Carmarthen which J. Loth<sup>25</sup> assigns confidently to the first half of the twelfth century are somewhat disquieting, for they seem to include (in a variant form) features which even Miss Schoepperle does not ascribe to Celtic tradition. Yet the period just mentioned would be too early for the influence of a French romance.

It will be observed that Miss Schoepperle's treatise marks a real advance in our knowledge of the evolution of this famous legend. Indeed, unless new Celtic material by some chance should come to light, I do not believe that we shall ever be in a position to see much further into the matters which she treats of in this volume. Possibly, a closer study of the subject may define more clearly the nature and scope of what she calls the B-version. I should also like to see the literature of French folk-tales ransacked for Tristan *motifs* with the same thoroughness that is here applied to the Celtic materials. Experience has shown that many of the most important *motifs* which students of Arthurian sources are accustomed to accept without question as specifically Celtic are found in the oral traditions of other people as well. Illuminating on this point is Hans Siuts's *Jenseitsmotive im deutschen Volks-märchen* (Leipzig, 1911)—all the more so as the author seems unaware of the prevalence of the same *motifs* in Celtic lands.

In taking leave of this excellent book I wish to commend especially the clear and orderly way in which the evidence is marshalled and

the discussion conducted. The usual bane of investigation into the history of stories is the want of all sense of proportion that commonly afflicts the authors of such works. Neither writer nor reader can see clearly through the forest of minutiae. Moreover, a capacity for detecting resemblances between tales where resemblance there is none is also frequent with such investigators. From both of these faults Miss Schoepperle's work is conspicuously free.<sup>26</sup>

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

University of Tennessee.

---

*Schiller, die Geschichte seines Lebens* von  
ALEXANDER VON GLEICHEN-RUSSWURM.  
Stuttgart, Verlag Julius Hoffmann, 1913.  
556 pp. with 52 illustrations.

The discriminating spirit and the judicial poise which have characterized Schiller criticism since the centenary of the poet's death in 1905 are two of the healthiest signs in the domain of contemporary German letters. To be sure all the Schillerophobes have not yet been silenced. Eugen Dühring—in *Moderne Grössen*—still continues to launch his diatribes against the poet and Otto Böthlingk—in his *Schiller und Shakespeare*, 1910—has "out-Ludwighed" Otto Ludwig in demonstrating all that the English dramatist was and the German dramatist was not. Nevertheless the marked tendency, so prominent among scholars and critics during the preceding decades, to magnify Goethe at the expense of Schiller is gradually dying out. The ugly outbursts of such one-sided Goethophiles as Herman Grimm and Nietzsche, as well as the half-hearted extenuations of Schiller's apologists, have given way to a real de-

<sup>24</sup> To those which she cites add now the *Ystoria Tristan*, printed and discussed by J. Loth, *Revue Celtique*, XXXIV, 365 ff. (1913). Cp. too, his paper in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Bulletin de Mars-Avril*, 1913, pp. 92 ff.

<sup>25</sup> See his *Contributions à l'étude des romans de la Table Ronde*, pp. 113 ff. (Paris, 1912).

<sup>26</sup> Mention should be made of the five elaborate appendices which are added to the work. 1. The value of the extant redactions of Eilhart von Oberg's *Tristrant* as representing the *estoire*. 2. Points in which M. Bédier's reconstruction differs from the version of Eilhart. 3. The problem of the second Isolt. 4. The harp and the rote. 5. Tragic love stories in Irish literature (extracts from texts). An Index nominum and an Index rerum end the book.